arXiv:1404.7267v4 [math.AG] 9 Mar 2015

A RELATIVE HILBERT–MUMFORD CRITERION

MARTIN G. GULBRANDSEN, LARS H. HALLE, AND KLAUS HULEK

Abstract. We generalize the classical Hilbert–Mumford criteria for GIT (semi-)stability in terms of one parameter subgroups of a linearly reductive group G over a field k, to the relative situation of an equivariant, projective morphism $X \to \operatorname{Spec} A$ to a noetherian k-algebra A. We also extend the classical projectivity result for GIT quotients: the induced morphism $X^{ss}/G \to \operatorname{Spec} A^G$ is projective. As an example of applications to moduli problems, we consider degenerations of Hilbert schemes of points.

1. Introduction

Geometric invariant theory (GIT) is one of the most important tools in algebraic geometry. It was Mumford's seminal book [GIT] which brought the classical field of "invariants" into modern algebraic geometry. In particular moduli spaces are often constructed as quotients of a (quasi-projective) scheme X by a (reductive) algebraic group G. However, for the quotient to have good properties it is essential to restrict to (semi-)stable points in X. In applications, the most important result of Mumford's theory is perhaps the numerical characterization of (semi-)stable points in terms of 1-parameter subgroups (1-PS), given in [GIT, Theorem 2.1]. The context of this theorem is that X is a projective variety, $\mathscr{L}$ is an ample invertible sheaf on X and the action of G on X is G-linearized on $\mathscr{L}$.

Motivated by studying degenerations of Hilbert schemes we were led to consider the following relative situation: Let S be an affine, noetherian scheme over an arbitrary field k, and let X be a relatively projective scheme over S. Let G be a linearly reductive group over k, acting on X and on S, such that the structural morphism $f\colon X \to S$ is equivariant. Finally, let $\mathscr{L}$ be an ample, G-linearized invertible sheaf on X. Of course, as S is affine, ampleness is equivalent to relative ampleness over S.

Our aim is to find a numerical characterization, analogous to Mumford's theorem [GIT, Theorem 2.1], for the (semi-)stable points in X, with respect to the G-linearized sheaf $\mathscr{L}$. Consider the induced action of a one parameter subgroup $\lambda\colon \mathbb{G}_m \to G$, applied to a point p in X. If the limit p_0 exists in X, as $t \in \mathbb{G}_m$ goes to zero, then the invariant

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14L24 (primary); 13A50, 14D06 (secondary).

$\mu^{\mathscr{L}}(\lambda, p)$ is defined as the negative of the weight of the $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on the fibre $\mathscr{L}(p_0)$. In the absolute situation, where X is projective over k, the limit p_0 always exists. In our relative situation, we find that if p_0 does not exist, then the one parameter subgroup in question can be ignored; formally we let $\mu^{\mathscr{L}}(\lambda, p) = \infty$ in this case. Our criterion is then as follows (see Section 3):

Theorem 3.3. Let k be an arbitrary field and let $f\colon X \to S$ be a projective morphism of k-schemes. Assume $S = \operatorname{Spec} A$ is noetherian and affine. Let G be an affine, linearly reductive group over k, acting on X and on S such that f is equivariant, and let $\mathscr{L}$ be an ample, G-linearized invertible sheaf on X. Let $p\colon \operatorname{Spec} \Omega \to X$ be a geometric point.

(1) The geometric point p is stable if and only if $\mu^{\mathscr{L}}(\lambda, p) > 0$ for every non trivial 1-PS $\lambda\colon \mathbb{G}_{m,K} \to G_K$ and every field extension $\Omega \subset K$.
(2) The geometric point p is semi-stable if and only if $\mu^{\mathscr{L}}(\lambda, p) \geq 0$ for every 1-PS $\lambda\colon \mathbb{G}_{m,K} \to G_K$ and every field extension $\Omega \subset K$.

Moreover, if S is of finite type over k, then the above statements continue to hold with just $K = \Omega$, i.e. it suffices to test with 1-PSs defined over Ω.

We state also the special case of a finite type situation:

Corollary 1.1. *Assume the base scheme S is of finite type over an algebraically closed field k. Let $p \in X$ be a closed point.*

(1) *The point p is stable if and only if $\mu^{\mathscr{L}}(\lambda, p) > 0$ for every non-trivial 1-PS $\lambda\colon \mathbb{G}_m \to G$.*
(2) *The point p is semi-stable if and only if $\mu^{\mathscr{L}}(\lambda, p) \geq 0$ for every 1-PS $\lambda\colon \mathbb{G}_m \to G$.*

Already the special case $X = S = \mathbb{A}^n$ is interesting: we recover King's numerical criterion for (semi-)stability in affine space [Kin]. In this situation, $\mathscr{L}$ is necessarily trivial as an invertible sheaf, but its G-linearization may be nontrivial.

Our approach to proving the main theorem is to go back to Mumford's argument. This, however, is not straightforward. In the projective case any $\mathbb{G}_m$-action can be diagonalized, which makes it easy to compute the invariant $\mu^{\mathscr{L}}(\lambda, p)$. In our situation, we first embed X equivariantly into a projective fibre space $\mathbb{P}(V) \to S$, where V is a coherent sheaf on S with a G-action. The main challenge is then that we do not know a suitable diagonalization result for $\mathbb{G}_m$-actions on $\mathbb{P}(V)$. Our solution is to work directly with the isotypical decomposition $V = \bigoplus_d V_d$, which serves as a replacement for a diagonalizing basis. Going through the various steps carefully we see that the base S need not necessarily be of finite type, but that it suffices to assume

S to be noetherian. This is indeed a major advantage for moduli problems. Here $X \to S$ would typically be an S-valued point of some moduli functor, and the condition that S be of finite type would be unsatisfactory.

It was pointed out to us by A. Schmitt that in the (more special) situation of Corollary 1.1 there is another approach. Indeed, it is natural to reduce to $\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{A}^n$ by finding first an equivariant embedding of S into $\mathbb{A}^n$, and then, using $\mathscr{L}$, an equivariant embedding of X into $\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{A}^n$. The required criterion for $\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{A}^n$ can then be proved by compactifying to $\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{P}^n$ and applying Schmitt's criterion [Sch, Prop. 2.9] for a product of projective spaces.

Equivariant GIT has been considered in the literature by various authors in different settings: Reichstein [Rei] treats equivariant morphisms $f\colon X \to Y$ between projective varieties, and Hu [Hu] uses symplectic techniques to study equivariant morphisms between quasi-projective varieties. We also mention that Seshadri [Sesh2] develops GIT over an arbitrary noetherian ring, that is, in the situation where G acts trivially on the base $S = \operatorname{Spec} A$.

We shall now briefly outline the structure of the paper. In Section 2 we recall the notions of stable and semi-stable points and the existence of good and geometric quotients, closely following [GIT]. The main point of this section is to establish that, although Mumford works in the context of algebraic (pre)schemes, only the noetherian property is used when constructing the quotient. We also show that if X is projective over S, then the quotient is projective over $S/G = \operatorname{Spec} A^G$ (Proposition 2.6). In Section 3 we formally introduce the invariants $\mu^{\mathscr{L}}(\lambda, p)$ and state the main result (Theorem 3.3). In Section 4 we rephrase the property of (semi-)stability using a G-equivariant embedding of X into a projective fibre space $\mathbb{P}(V)$. We will then use this reformulation in the proof of the main result. Finally in Section 5 we prove our numerical characterization for (semi-)stable points. It is here that we reinterpret the invariants $\mu^{\mathscr{L}}(\lambda, p)$ in terms of the grading $V = \bigoplus_{d\in\mathbb{Z}} V_d$. We conclude the paper by discussing two examples in Section 6. In the first basic example we consider a simple action of $\mathbb{G}_m$ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{A}^2 \to \mathbb{A}^2$. In the second example we consider a family $X \subset \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{A}^1 \to \mathbb{A}^1$ which is the degeneration of a smooth conic into a pair of (different) lines. Here we discuss a good compactification of the degree 2 Hilbert scheme $\operatorname{Hilb}^2_{X^{\mathrm{sm}}/\mathbb{A}^1}$, where X^{sm} denotes the smooth locus of the morphism $f\colon X \to \mathbb{A}^1$ given by projection to the second factor. We have good control over an invertible sheaf on the relative Hilbert scheme giving Grothendieck's projective embedding, whereas the embedding itself is unwieldy. Hence we prefer the language of linearized invertible sheaves over equivariant projective embeddings. This is a toy example of the situation which we investigate in a forthcoming

paper where we consider degenerations of Hilbert schemes of points on $K3$-surfaces.

Acknowledgments. We thank Friedrich Knop, Peter Littelmann and David Rydh (to whom we owe Remark 2.2) for useful discussions. The first author would like to thank NFR for partial support under grant 230986. The third author would like to thank DFG for partial support under grant Hu 337/6-2 and also the Fund for Mathematics to the Institute of Advanced Study in Princeton, which provided excellent working conditions.

1.1. **Notation and preliminaries.** We list here some notation and facts used throughout the paper.

If $\mathscr{F}$ is a coherent sheaf on S, we use Grothendieck's contravariant notations:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathscr{F}) = \operatorname{Proj} \operatorname{Sym} \mathscr{F}$$
$$\mathbb{V}(\mathscr{F}) = \operatorname{Spec} \operatorname{Sym} \mathscr{F}$$

The sheaf of sections of $\mathbb{V}(\mathscr{F})$ is $\mathscr{F}^\vee$.

Let Y be a k-scheme and assume that G acts on Y. For a k-scheme T and T-valued points $p\colon T \to Y$ and $g\colon T \to G$, we write $g\cdot p\colon T \to Y$ for the result of acting by g on p. We denote by $G \cdot p$ the orbit of p. It is a set in $Y \times_k T$. We denote by G_p the stabilizer of p. This is a subgroup scheme of $G \times_k T$. The action is *closed* if the orbits of all geometric points are closed.

Let $k \subset K$ be a field extension. Then G is linearly reductive if and only if G_K is linearly reductive.

2. The GIT quotient

We recall the notions of stable and semi-stable points and the existence theorem for good and geometric quotients, following Mumford [GIT]. The main point is to establish that although Mumford works in the context of algebraic (pre)schemes, only the noetherian property is used when constructing the quotient. Moreover, in Proposition 2.6, we extend the classical projectivity result for GIT quotients to the relative case of an equivariant projective morphism $X \to S$ to a noetherian affine base scheme S.

All schemes and morphisms in this section are defined over the field k. Let G be an affine, linearly reductive algebraic group and let X be a scheme equipped with an action $\sigma\colon G \times X \to X$. A morphism $\phi\colon X \to Y$ to another scheme Y is *invariant* if $\phi \circ \sigma = \phi \circ p_2$ as morphisms $G \times X \to Y$.

The notions of good and geometric quotients are well established, but as variations do occur, we give the definitions we shall use.

Definition 2.1 (Mumford [GIT, Remark 6, §0.2], Seshadri [Sesh, Def. 1.5])**.** A morphism $\phi\colon X \to Y$ is a *good quotient* if it is invariant and affine, and

(i) for each closed invariant subscheme $W \subset X$, the image $\phi(W)$ is a closed subset of Y,
(ii) for each collection $\{W_i\}_{i\in I}$ of closed invariant subschemes $W_i \subset X$, we have an equality

$$\phi(\textstyle\bigcap_i W_i) = \bigcap_i \phi(W_i)$$

of schemes,
(iii) the sheaf homomorphism $\phi^*\colon \mathscr{O}_Y \to \phi_*\mathscr{O}_X$ is injective and its image is the invariant subsheaf $(\phi_*\mathscr{O}_X)^G$.

Remark 2.2. If $W \subset X$ is an invariant closed subset, then there exists an invariant subscheme structure on W. In fact, first let W_{red} be the reduced closed subscheme. Then give W the scheme structure as the schematic image of the morphism $G \times W_{red} \to X$.

Definition 2.3 (Mumford [GIT, Def. 0.6])**.** A morphism $\phi\colon X \to Y$ is a *geometric quotient* if it is good and the morphism $(\sigma, p_2)\colon G \times X \to X \times_Y X$ is surjective.

A morphism $\phi\colon X \to Y$ is *universally* geometric or good if it stays geometric or good after arbitrary base change.

Let $\mathscr{L}$ be an invertible sheaf on X equipped with a G-linearization.

Definition 2.4 (Mumford [GIT, Def. 1.7])**.** Let p be a geometric point in X.

(1) p is *semi-stable* with respect to $\mathscr{L}$ if there is a section $\sigma \in H(X, \mathscr{L}^n)^G$ for some $n > 0$ such that X_σ is affine and $\sigma(p) \neq 0$.
(2) p is *stable* with respect to $\mathscr{L}$ if there is a section σ as above, such that, in addition, the action of G on X_σ is closed and the stabilizer group of every point in X_σ is finite.

We denote by $X^{ss}(\mathscr{L})$ and $X^{s}(\mathscr{L})$ the open subsets of X whose geometric points are the semi-stable, respectively stable, geometric points in X.

A stable point in the above sense is called *properly* stable in the terminology of [GIT].

Theorem 2.5. *Let G be an affine, linearly reductive algebraic group over a field k. Let X be a noetherian scheme over k, equipped with a G-action and a G-linearized invertible sheaf $\mathscr{L}$.*

(1) *There exists a universally good quotient $\phi\colon X^{ss}(\mathscr{L}) \to Y$. Moreover, there is an ample invertible sheaf $\mathscr{M}$ on Y such that $\phi^*\mathscr{M} \cong \mathscr{L}^{\otimes n}$ for some $n > 0$.*

(2) *There is an open subset* $\widetilde{Y} \subseteq Y$ *such that* $X^s(\mathscr{L}) = \phi^{-1}(\widetilde{Y})$ *and such that the restriction* $X^s(\mathscr{L}) \to \widetilde{Y}$ *of* ϕ *is a universally geometric quotient.*

Proof. This is essentially Mumford's Theorem 1.10 [GIT]. In the statement of that theorem, X is assumed to be of finite type, but the proof uses only that X is noetherian. For use in Proposition 2.6 below, we recall briefly the main points in the construction of Y and $\mathscr{M}$.

The semi-stable locus X^{ss} is the union of all affine open subsets of the form X_σ, where σ runs through $\Gamma(X, \mathscr{L}^n)^G$ for all $n > 0$. Since X is noetherian, X^{ss} can be covered by finitely many such subsets $U_i = X_{\sigma_i}$, and we may suppose that all $\sigma_i \in \Gamma(X, \mathscr{L}^n)^G$ for a common $n > 0$. Suppose $U_i = \operatorname{Spec} R_i$ and let $V_i = \operatorname{Spec} R_i^G$. By [GIT, Theorem 1.1] and its proof, the canonical morphism $\phi_i \colon U_i \to V_i$ is a good quotient, and for every fibre diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U_i' & \longrightarrow & U_i \\ {\scriptstyle \phi_i'}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi_i} \\ V_i' & \longrightarrow & V_i \end{array}$$

where V_i' is affine, also $\phi_i' \colon U_i \to V_i'$ is an affine quotient, i.e. induced by an inclusion of the form $A^G \subset A$, so it is again good. It follows that the ϕ_i's can be glued to form $\phi \colon X^{ss} \to Y$, and (using that being good is Zariski local on the target), that ϕ is universally good.

The ample invertible sheaf $\mathscr{M}$ is given by a cocycle $\{\sigma_{ij}\}$ for the open cover $\{V_i\}$ of Y, constructed as follows: the quotient σ_j/σ_i is a G-invariant regular function on U_i, hence is a regular function on V_i. Its restriction to $V_i \cap V_j$ is σ_{ij}. Ampleness is proved using the criterion [EGAII, Théorème 4.5.2(a')], which applies when Y is noetherian, and this holds since Y is constructed by glueing together a finite number of spectra of noetherian rings. □

We shall now state a proposition which asserts that if X is relatively projective, then the same holds for the quotient. In the classical situation $S = \operatorname{Spec} k$, see [GIT, the paragraph before Converse 1.12] or [Sesh, Theorem 1.1].

Proposition 2.6. *Let* G, X, $\mathscr{L}$, Y *and* $\mathscr{M}$ *be as in Theorem 2.5. Assume moreover that* $\mathscr{L}$ *is ample,* X *is relatively projective over an affine noetherian scheme* $S = \operatorname{Spec} A$, *and* G *acts on* S *in such a way that the projection* $X \to S$ *is equivariant.*

(1) *Let* T *be the ring* $\bigoplus_{d \geq 0} H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^d)$ *of sections. Then there are isomorphisms* $Y \cong \operatorname{Proj} T^G$ *and* $\mathscr{M} \cong \mathscr{O}_Y(n)$ *for some* n.
(2) Y *is relatively projective over* $\operatorname{Spec} A^G$.

Note that, as S is affine, an invertible sheaf $\mathscr{L}$ on X is ample if and only if it is relatively ample over S.

Proof. We note that the section ring $T^{(n)} = \bigoplus_{d\geq 0} H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^{dn})$ for an appropriate tensor power $\mathscr{L}^n$ is finitely generated as a T_0-algebra and $X \cong \operatorname{Proj} T$ over T_0 [Liu, Lemma 8.1.23]. We also note that T_0 is finite as an A-module, as X is proper over A.

Using essentially Hilbert's argument for finite generation of invariant rings, we will prove:

(i) T_0^G is a finite A^G-module
(ii) There exists an integer $n > 0$ such that the Veronese subring $(T^G)^{(n)}$ of the invariant ring T^G is finitely generated as a T_0^G-algebra.

Claim (ii) implies that $\operatorname{Proj} T^G$ is projective over $\operatorname{Spec} T_0^G$. Claim (i) then implies that $\operatorname{Proj} T^G$ is projective over $\operatorname{Spec} A^G$ as well.

To prove (i), consider the A-submodule $AT_0^G \subset T_0$ generated by T_0^G. As T_0 is finite as an A-module and A is noetherian, T_0 is a noetherian A-module, so AT_0^G is finitely generated, and we may choose a finite generating set $t_1, \ldots, t_r$ in T_0^G. We claim that these elements in fact generate T_0^G as an A^G-module. For let $t \in T_0^G$, then

$$t = a_1 t_1 + \cdots + a_r t_r$$

with $a_i \in A$. Apply the Reynolds operator E to obtain

$$t = E(t) = E(a_1)t_1 + \cdots + E(a_r)t_r$$

by the Reynolds identity. Since $E(a_i) \in A^G$, we are done.

For (ii), we first replace T by $T^{(n)}$ if necessary, to ensure that T is finitely generated as a T_0-algebra. Since A is a noetherian ring, so is T_0 and thus also T. Let $J \subset T$ be the ideal generated by all homogeneous, G-invariant elements of positive degree. As T is noetherian, J is finitely generated, say by homogeneous elements $f_1, \ldots, f_m \in T^G$. Consider the subalgebra $T_0^G[f_1, \ldots, f_m] \subseteq T^G$. Let $f \in T^G$ be a homogeneous element of degree d. We claim that $f \in T_0^G[f_1, \ldots, f_m]$. This is trivial for $d = 0$. If $d > 0$ then $f \in J$, so we may write

$$f = h_1 f_1 + \cdots + h_m f_m, \quad h_i \in T$$

and we may assume all h_i are homogeneous of degree $< d$. Apply the Reynolds operator E to obtain

$$f = E(h_1)f_1 + \cdots + E(h_m)f_m$$

by the Reynolds identity. Now E preserves degree, so $E(h_i)$ are invariant of degree $< d$. By induction on d, we are done.

It remains to exhibit the isomorphisms $Y \cong \operatorname{Proj} T^G$ and $\mathscr{M} \cong \mathscr{O}_Y(n)$. Since $X = \operatorname{Proj} T$, the affine open subset U_i in the proof of Theorem 2.5 is $\operatorname{Spec} T_{(\sigma_i)}$ and thus the quotient V_i is $\operatorname{Spec} T_{(\sigma_i)}^G$. On the other hand, $\operatorname{Proj} T^G$ is covered by affine open subschemes $\operatorname{Spec} T_{(\sigma)}^G$, where σ runs through $T_n^G = \Gamma(X, \mathscr{L}^n)^G$ for all $n > 0$. As T^G is finitely generated, $\operatorname{Proj} T^G$ can be covered by finitely many such open

affine subschemes $V_i = \operatorname{Spec} T^G_{(\sigma_i)}$, and we may then assume $\sigma_i \in T^G_n$ for a common $n > 0$. These open affine subschemes are glued along $U_i \cap U_j = \operatorname{Spec} T^G_{(\sigma_i\sigma_j)}$ via the identifications $T^G_{(\sigma_i\sigma_j)} = (T^G_{(\sigma_i)})_{\sigma_j/\sigma_i}$. But this is precisely the construction of Y in Theorem 2.5. Moreover, the invertible sheaf $\mathscr{O}(n)$ on $\operatorname{Proj} T^G$, or equivalently $\mathscr{O}(1)$ on $\operatorname{Proj}(T^G)^{(n)}$, corresponds to the cocycle $\{\sigma_{ij} = \sigma_j/\sigma_i\}$ for the open cover $\{V_i\}$. Thus $\mathscr{O}(n)$ agrees with $\mathscr{M}$. □

We quote the following two results from [GIT]:

Proposition 2.7. *The following are equivalent conditions on a geometric semi-stable point $p\colon \operatorname{Spec}\Omega \to X$:*

(1) *p is stable.*
(2) *The stabilizer group G_p is finite and the orbit $G \cdot p$ is closed in $X^{ss}(\mathscr{L})_\Omega$.*
(3) *The stabilizer group G_p is finite and there is a section $\sigma \in H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^n)^G$ for a suitable $n > 0$ such that the orbit $G \cdot p$ is closed in $(X_\sigma)_\Omega$.*

Proof. This is [GIT, Amplification 1.11] (with "regular" replaced by "finite stabilizer", since we work with properly stable points). Although Mumford's X is of finite type, the proof goes through without change as long as Theorem 2.5 on the existence of quotients holds, which we have established in the noetherian situation. □

Lemma 2.8. *Let $k \subset K$ be an arbitrary field extension, and let $\mathscr{L}_K$ be the pullback of $\mathscr{L}$ to X_K. Then $X^s(\mathscr{L})_K = X^s_K(\mathscr{L}_K)$ and $X^{ss}(\mathscr{L})_K = X^{ss}_K(\mathscr{L}_K)$.*

Proof. This is [GIT, Proposition 1.14], where $\mathscr{L}$ is not assumed to be ample. In the ample case, where the open subsets $X_\sigma \subset X$ for $\sigma \in H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^d)$ are automatically affine, this is easier, so we give the proof in this case, arguing as in [GIT, Amplification 1.11].

Because of the characterization in Proposition 2.7(2) of stable points, among semi-stable ones, it suffices to show the semi-stable case.

We have

$$H^0(X_K, \mathscr{L}^d_K) = H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^d) \otimes_k K.$$

If p is a geometric point in $X^{ss}_K(\mathscr{L}_K)$, then there is an invariant section $\sigma = \sum_i \sigma_i \otimes \alpha_i$ which is nonzero on p. We may assume the elements $\alpha_i \in K$ are linearly independent; then it follows that each σ_i is invariant. At least one σ_i is nonzero on p, hence p is in $X^{ss}(\mathscr{L})_K$. The other inclusion $X^{ss}(\mathscr{L})_K \subset X^{ss}_K(\mathscr{L}_K)$ is trivial. □

3. The numerical criterion — statement

Let $p\colon \operatorname{Spec}\Omega \to X$ be a geometric point and let $\lambda\colon \mathbb{G}_{m,K} \to G_K$ be a 1-parameter subgroup over some field extension $\Omega \subset K$. Action by $\mathbb{G}_m$ on p defines a morphism $\mathbb{G}_{m,K} \to X_K$, and we may ask whether

this extends to $\mathbb{A}^1_K \to X_K$. If it does, it does so uniquely, as X is separated, and restriction to $0 \in \mathbb{A}^1_K$ defines a K-valued limit point $p_0 \colon \operatorname{Spec} K \to X_K$, which we will denote

$$p_0 = \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t) \cdot p.$$

It is a fixed point for the action of $\mathbb{G}_{m,K}$.

Definition 3.1. In the above situation, we let $\mu^{\mathscr{L}}(\lambda, p)$ denote the negative of the $\mathbb{G}_{m,K}$-weight on the fibre $\mathscr{L}(p_0)$, provided the limit point p_0 exists. Otherwise, we let $\mu^{\mathscr{L}}(\lambda, p) = \infty$.

Remark 3.2. In order to simplify notation we shall sometimes write $\mu(\lambda, p)$ instead of $\mu^{\mathscr{L}}(\lambda, p)$ when it is clear which line bundle $\mathscr{L}$ we refer to.

Theorem 3.3. *Let k be an arbitrary field and let $f \colon X \to S$ be a projective morphism of k-schemes. Assume $S = \operatorname{Spec} A$ is noetherian and affine. Let G be an affine, linearly reductive group over k, acting on X and on S such that f is equivariant, and let $\mathscr{L}$ be an ample, G-linearized invertible sheaf on X. Let $p \colon \operatorname{Spec} \Omega \to X$ be a geometric point.*

1. *The geometric point p is stable if and only if $\mu^{\mathscr{L}}(\lambda, p) > 0$ for every non trivial 1-PS $\lambda \colon \mathbb{G}_{m,K} \to G_K$ and every field extension $\Omega \subset K$.*
2. *The geometric point p is semi-stable if and only if $\mu^{\mathscr{L}}(\lambda, p) \geq 0$ for every 1-PS $\lambda \colon \mathbb{G}_{m,K} \to G_K$ and every field extension $\Omega \subset K$.*

Moreover, if S is of finite type over k, then the above statements continue to hold with just $K = \Omega$, i.e. it suffices to test with 1-PSs defined over Ω.

Note that, to detect (semi-)stability, it suffices to test with one parameter subgroups for which the limit point p_0 in Definition 3.1 exists, since the value of μ is infinite otherwise. Since $f \colon X \to S$ is relatively projective, the valuative criterion for properness shows that the limit point p_0 in X exists if and only if the limit $\lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t) \cdot f(p)$ exists in S.

We may view the geometric point p as a closed point in X_Ω. Since (semi-)stability is preserved by the base change to Ω by Lemma 2.8, we may thus, without loss of generality, assume that k is algebraically closed and p is a closed point. We assume this in the remainder of this paper.

4. Geometric criteria

We continue to work with a projective, G-equivariant morphism $f \colon X \to S$, where $S = \operatorname{Spec} A$ for a noetherian k-algebra A, and an ample, G-linearized invertible sheaf $\mathscr{L}$ on X. By replacing $\mathscr{L}$ with a

tensor power, which does not affect the stable or semi-stable loci in X, we may assume that $\mathscr{L}$ is f-very ample.

Let $V = H^0(X, \mathscr{L})$, considered as an A-module, and let

$$T = \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^d)$$

be the section ring of $\mathscr{L}$. After replacing $\mathscr{L}$ by a further tensor power if necessary, we may assume that T is finitely generated by $T_1 = V$ as a T_0-algebra, and $X = \operatorname{Proj} T$ [Liu, Lemma 8.1.23]. We let

$$X^* = \operatorname{Spec} T$$

be the affine cone over X. The surjection $\operatorname{Sym} V \to T$ induces closed embeddings $X \subset \mathbb{P}(V)$ and $X^* \subset \mathbb{V}(V)$. We write 0_S for the zero section in $\mathbb{V}(V)$.

Our aim in this section is to characterize (semi-)stability of a point in $X \subset \mathbb{P}(V)$ in terms of the orbit of a lift to $\mathbb{V}(V)$; these are the geometric criteria for (semi-)stability.

First we need a lemma: let W be a k-scheme and assume G acts on W. Recall that for every point $w \in W(k)$, there is an induced map

$$\phi_w \colon G \to W$$

defined by $g \mapsto g \cdot w$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let W be a separated k-scheme, let $\sigma : G \times W \to W$ be an algebraic action and let $w \in W$ be a closed point. Then*

$$\phi_w \colon G \to W$$

is proper if and only if $G \cdot w$ is closed in W and the stabilizer G_w is finite.

See [GIT, Lemma 0.3] and [New, Lemma 3.17]; the latter is phrased for varieties, but the proof goes through in wide generality, and it is the one we follow below.

Proof. If ϕ_w is proper, its image $G \cdot w$ is closed in W. Moreover, G_w is proper over k and is closed (being the fibre over the closed point w) in G, which is affine and of finite type. Thus G_w is finite.

Assume now that $G \cdot w$ is closed in W and that G_w is finite. Let $Z \subset W$ be the schematic image of the (quasi-compact) morphism ϕ_w. Since G is of finite type over k, the set $G(k)$ is dense in G, and its image forms a dense subset of Z. As Z is an invariant subscheme, we may replace W by Z.

The map ϕ_w is quasi-finite, since this holds locally at any point in G_w, and thus everywhere by translation. By [Stacks, Lemma `03I1`], there exists an open dense $U \subset Z$ such that the restriction $\phi_w^{-1}(U) \to U$ is finite. The translates of U must cover Z, so ϕ_w is indeed finite and hence proper. □

Proposition 4.2. *Let $p \in X$ be a closed point and let $p^* \in X^*$ denote any lift. Denote by $\mathrm{cl}(G \cdot p^*)$ the closure of the orbit of p^* in $\mathbb{V}(V)$.*

(1) *$p \in X^{ss}$ if and only if $0_S \cap \mathrm{cl}(G \cdot p^*) = \emptyset$ inside $\mathbb{V}(V)$.*
(2) *$p \in X^s$ if and only if $\phi_{p^*} \colon G \to \mathbb{V}(V)$ is proper.*

Proof. This is a direct extension of [GIT, Prop. 2.2], and we just check that the proof given by Mumford goes through in the relative situation.

Let $Z = 0_S \cap X^*$.

(1) If $p \in X^{ss}$, there is an invariant section σ of $\mathscr{L}^d$, with $d > 0$, such that $\sigma(p) \neq 0$. As σ is invariant, it is constant (and nonzero, as $\sigma(p) \neq 0$) on the orbit $G \cdot p^*$, hence on its closure. But σ is zero on Z, since $d > 0$. Thus $\mathrm{cl}(G \cdot p^*)$ cannot intersect 0_S.

For the converse, observe that since Z and $\mathrm{cl}(G \cdot p^*)$ are closed and invariant in X^*, the reductivity of G implies that we can find an invariant element $\sigma \in T^G$ such that $\sigma \equiv 1$ on $\mathrm{cl}(G \cdot p^*)$ and $\sigma \equiv 0$ on Z. This implies that some homogeneous component $\sigma_d \in T_d = H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^d)$ of σ of degree $d > 0$ satisfies $\sigma(p^*) \neq 0$. As the G-action respects the grading on the coordinate ring, this component σ_d is invariant.

(2) Assume ϕ_{p^*} is proper. In particular the orbit $G \cdot p^*$ is closed; then $0_S \cap \mathrm{cl}(G \cdot p^*) = \emptyset$, since 0_S is G-invariant. By the first part, p is semi-stable, so we can find an invariant section $\sigma \in H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^d)$ with $d > 0$ such that $\sigma(p^*)$ is nonzero. By scaling σ, we may assume $\sigma(p^*) = 1$. Let

$$W = \operatorname{Spec} T/(\sigma - 1) \subset X^* \setminus Z.$$

The open locus $\sigma \neq 0$ in X is

$$X_\sigma = \operatorname{Spec} T^{(d)}/(\sigma - 1)$$

(where $T^{(d)} = \bigoplus_n T_{nd}$). Then $T/(\sigma - 1)$ is finite as a module over its subalgebra $T^{(d)}/(\sigma - 1)$, hence $W \to X_\sigma$ is finite and surjective.

Thus we have a diagram



in which π is finite, and hence proper. Then ϕ_p is proper if and only if ϕ_{p^*} is proper. We have assumed ϕ_{p^*} is proper, so ϕ_p is proper. By Lemma 4.1, $G \cdot p$ is closed in X_σ, and G_p is finite. By Proposition 2.7(3), p is stable.

Conversely, if p is stable, then it is certainly semi-stable, so again we have the diagram above. By Proposition 2.7(2), $G \cdot p$ closed in X_σ and G_p is finite. So ϕ_p is proper by Lemma 4.1, and thus ϕ_{p^*} is proper. □

5. The numerical criterion — proof

We now use the geometric criteria from the previous section to establish the numerical criterion in Theorem 3.3.

Definition 5.1. By a *linear* action of an affine group $G = \operatorname{Spec} B$ on $\mathbb{V}(V)$, we mean an action

$$G \times \mathbb{V}(V) \to \mathbb{V}(V)$$

such that the image of $V \subset \operatorname{Sym} V$, under the corresponding ring homomorphism $\operatorname{Sym} V \to B \otimes \operatorname{Sym} V$, is contained in $B \otimes V$.

The action on $\mathbb{V}(V) = \mathbb{V}(H^0(X, \mathscr{L}))$ induced by the linearization of $\mathscr{L}$ is (clearly) linear.

Lemma 5.2. *Let A be a ring and V an A-module.*

1. *There is a canonical one to one correspondence between $\mathbb{G}_m$-actions on $\operatorname{Spec} A$ and gradings $A = \bigoplus_{d\in\mathbb{Z}} A_d$.*
2. *Given an action as in (1), there is a canonical one to one correspondence between linear actions on $\mathbb{V}(V)$, such that the projection $\mathbb{V}(V) \to \operatorname{Spec} A$ is equivariant, and gradings $V = \bigoplus_{d\in\mathbb{Z}} V_d$ making V a graded A-module.*

Proof. This is well known; we briefly sketch the argument. A $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\operatorname{Spec} A$ corresponds to a ring homomorphism

$$A \to A[t, t^{-1}]$$

and we let $A_d \subset A$ consist of all elements $a \in A$ which are mapped to at^d. One shows $A = \bigoplus A_d$ by using the identity and associativity group axioms. A linear $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\mathbb{V}(V)$, over a given action on $\operatorname{Spec} A$, corresponds to an A-module homomorphism

$$V \to V[t, t^{-1}]$$

(where $V[t, t^{-1}]$ is an A-module via the given action $A \to A[t, t^{-1}]$) and we let $V_d \subset V$ consist of all elements $v \in V$ which are mapped to vt^d. One shows $V = \bigoplus V_d$ by using the identity and associativity group axioms, and $A_d V_e \subset V_{d+e}$ is immediate. □

In the absolute case of a projective scheme over k, any action of a one parameter subgroup on $\mathbb{P}^n_k$ can be diagonalized. To handle the relative situation $\mathbb{P}(V) \to S$, we next introduce a construction that will replace the coordinates of a point with respect to a diagonalizing basis.

An R-valued point $v\colon \operatorname{Spec} R \to \mathbb{V}(V)$ is equivalent to a pair

$$A \to R \quad (k\text{-algebra homomorphism})$$
$$V \to R \quad (A\text{-module homomorphism}).$$

In fact, the first homomorphism $A \to R$ defines the base point

$$f(v)\colon \operatorname{Spec} R \to \operatorname{Spec} A,$$

and the second homomorphism $V \to R$ (in which R is considered as an A-algebra through $f(v)$) determines and is determined by an A-algebra homomorphism $\operatorname{Sym} V \to R$, which defines v. When $\mathbb{G}_m$ acts on $\operatorname{Spec} A$ and $\mathbb{V}(V)$ compatibly, so that we have gradings $A = \bigoplus A_d$ and $V = \bigoplus V_d$, we shall write

$$[v]_d \colon V_d \to R$$

for the composition $V_d \subset V \to R$ (a k-module homomorphism). Together, $f(v)$ and all $[v]_d$ determine the point v uniquely. Similarly, we shall write

$$[f(v)]_d \colon A_d \to R$$

for the composition $A_d \subset A \to R$.

The effect of the $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $[v]_d$ can be described as follows: an R-valued point g of $\mathbb{G}_m = \operatorname{Spec} k[t, t^{-1}]$ is a k-algebra homomorphism

$$k[t, t^{-1}] \to R,$$

i.e. an invertible element $T \in R$ (the image of t). Its action on $v \in \mathbb{V}(V)(R)$ is the R-valued point

$$\operatorname{Spec} R \xrightarrow{(g,v)} \mathbb{G}_m \times_k \mathbb{V}(V) \to \mathbb{V}(V)$$

or dually:

$$\operatorname{Sym} V \to (\operatorname{Sym} V)[t, t^{-1}] \to R.$$

Its restriction

$$V_d \to V_d t^d \to R$$

is $T^d[v]_d$, i.e. the homomorphism $[v]_d \colon V_d \to R$, followed by multiplication by T^d in R. Thus we have

$$[g \cdot v]_d = T^d [v]_d$$

and similarly

$$[g \cdot f(v)]_d = T^d [f(v)]_d.$$

Together, these two expressions determine $g \cdot v$ uniquely. For the canonical $k(\!(t)\!)$-valued point in $\operatorname{Spec} k[t, t^{-1}]$ given by

$$k[t, t^{-1}] \subset k(\!(t)\!),$$

the invertible element T above is $t \in k(\!(t)\!)$.

We next show that the numerical invariant $\mu^{\mathscr{L}}(p, \lambda)$ in the case of $\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{O}(1)$ on $\mathbb{P}(V)$ (for a linear action as in Definition 5.1), can be expressed in terms of the (non) vanishing of $[p^*]_d$ for a lift $p^* \in \mathbb{V}(V)$ of $p \in \mathbb{P}(V)$. This is our replacement for [GIT, Prop. 2.3], expressing the numerical invariant on $\mathbb{P}^n_k$ using coordinates with respect to a diagonalizing basis.

Lemma 5.3. *For a closed point $p \in \mathbb{P}(V)$, and any lift $p^* \in \mathbb{V}(V)$, we have*

$$\mu^{\mathscr{O}(1)}(p, \lambda) = -\min\{d \mid [p^*]_d \colon V_d \to k \text{ is nonzero}\}$$

for the grading $V = \bigoplus V_d$ induced by λ. We allow the possibility $\mu = \infty$.

Proof. We divide the proof in two parts: first we treat the case where μ is infinite.

By definition, $\mu^{\mathscr{O}(1)}(p,\lambda) = \infty$ if and only if the limit $\lim_{t\to 0}\lambda(t)\cdot p$ does not exist. As $\mathbb{P}(V) \to S$ is proper, this happens if and only if the limit $\lim_{t\to 0}\lambda(t)\cdot f(p)$ in S does not exist, by the valuative criterion for properness. The limit in S exists if and only if $[f(p)]_d = 0$ for all $d < 0$. We want to show that this is equivalent to the statement that for any d_0, there exists $d < d_0$ such that $[p^*]_d \neq 0$.

Suppose the limit in S does not exist. Then there is a homogeneous element $a \in A_{-e}$ for some $e > 0$, such that $[f(p)]_{-e}\colon A_{-e} \to k$ is nonzero on a. Let p^* be a lift of p; it is a point in $\mathbb{V}(V) \setminus 0_S$, and we have $[p^*]_d \neq 0$ for some d, since otherwise p^* would be in the zero section 0_S. Pick any $v \in V_d$ such that $[p^*]_d(v) \neq 0$. Now, for every $N > 0$, the product $a^N v \in V_{d-Ne}$ is an element on which $[p^*]_{d-Ne}$ is nonzero.

Suppose the limit in S exists, so that $[f(p)]_d = 0$ for all $d < 0$. The A-module V is finitely generated, say by homogeneous elements $g_i \in V_{d_i}$. Now an arbitrary element in V_d can be written $\sum_i a_i g_i$ where $a_i \in A_{d-d_i}$. Since the homomorphism $V \to k$ defining p^* is A-linear, it sends $a_i g_i$ to the product of $[f(p)]_{d-d_i}(a_i)$ and $[p^*]_{d_i}(g_i)$. But $[f(p)]_{d-d_i} = 0$ for all $d < d_i$. Thus $[p^*]_d = 0$ for d smaller than the degree of all the finitely many generators g_i.

Next we treat the case where the invariant μ is finite, i.e. the limit $p_0 = \lim_{t\to 0}\lambda(t)\cdot p$ exists.

The universal rank 1 quotient

$$V \otimes_A \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}(V)} \to \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}(V)}(1)$$

induces a closed immersion

$$L = \mathbb{V}(\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}(V)}(1)) \subset \mathbb{V}(V \otimes_A \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}(V)}) = \mathbb{V}(V) \times_A \mathbb{P}(V)$$

and L is the line bundle corresponding (contravariantly) to the invertible sheaf $\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}(V)}(1)$. This immersion is equivariant with respect to the given G-actions on L (via the linearization) and on $\mathbb{V}(V)$ and $\mathbb{P}(V)$. Over the limit point p_0, we have fibres

$$L(p_0) \subset \mathbb{V}(V)(f(p_0)).$$

Let r denote the minimal d such that $[p^*]_d$ is nonzero. We shall find a lift $p_0^* \in \mathbb{V}(V)$ of p_0 (necessarily in $L(p_0)$, by definition of "lift") and show that $g \in \mathbb{G}_m$ acts on p_0^* by scalar multiplication with g^r.

For an arbitrary lift p^* of p, we have $[p^*]_r \neq 0$ and $[p^*]_d = 0$ for $d < r$. The action of $\mathbb{G}_m$ on $\mathbb{V}(V)$ corresponds to a grading $V = \bigoplus V_d$. Now modify this action by shifting the degrees by r: let $V = \bigoplus_d V'_d$, where $V'_d = V_{d+r}$ has degree d. This does not change the action on $\mathbb{P}(V)$, i.e. we have only changed its linearization. With respect to this new grading, the "homogeneous components" of p^* are $[p^*]'_d = [p^*]_{d+r}$,

so that $[p^*]'_d = 0$ for all $d < 0$. The ring homomorphism

$$\operatorname{Sym} V \to k[t, t^{-1}]$$

corresponding to the (modified) action $\mathbb{G}_m \to \mathbb{V}(V)$ on p^* has image in $k[t]$, since both $A = \operatorname{Sym}^0 V$ (by assumption on $f(p)$) and $V = \operatorname{Sym}^1 V$ have image in $k[t]$. The specialization p_0^* to $t = 0$ is a lift of p_0. Moreover, returning to the original grading $V = \bigoplus_d V_d$, we have

$$[p_0^*]_d = \begin{cases} [p^*]_r & \text{for } d = r \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence $g \in \mathbb{G}_m$ acts on p_0^* by scalar multiplication with g^r. □

We shall abbreviate $\mu^{\mathscr{O}(1)}(\lambda, p)$ to $\mu(\lambda, p)$ in the following.

By the geometric criteria in Proposition 4.2, the Hilbert–Mumford criterion in Theorem 3.3 reduces to the following:

Theorem 5.4. *Let $p \in \mathbb{P}(V)$ and let $p^* \in \mathbb{V}(V)$ be an arbitrary lift.*

1. *$\phi_{p^*} \colon G \to \mathbb{V}(V)$ is not proper if and only if there is a field extension $k \subset K$ and a nontrivial 1-PS $\lambda \colon \mathbb{G}_{m,K} \to G_K$ such that $\mu(\lambda, p) \leq 0$.*
2. *The zero section $0_S \subset \mathbb{V}(V)$ intersects the closure of the orbit $G \cdot p^*$ non-trivially if and only if there is a field extension $k \subset K$ and a 1-PS $\lambda \colon \mathbb{G}_{m,K} \to G_K$, such that $\mu(\lambda, p) < 0$.*

Moreover, if S is of finite type over k, then the above statements continue to hold with just $K = k$.

Some notation in preparation for the proof: there are inclusions of k-algebras

$$k \subset k[t] \subset k[\![t]\!] \subset k(\!(t)\!)$$

and

$$k \subset k[t] \subset k[t, t^{-1}] \subset k(\!(t)\!).$$

($k[\![t]\!]$ is the algebra of formal power series, with the field $k(\!(t)\!)$ of formal Laurent series as quotient field.) Thus any valued point (in a separated scheme), with values in any of these algebras, can be considered as a $k(\!(t)\!)$-valued point, and we may ask whether such a point in fact takes values in one of the smaller algebras. If it takes value in (at least) $k[\![t]\!]$, we may consider the limit as $t \to 0$, i.e. the composition with $\operatorname{Spec} k \to \operatorname{Spec} k[\![t]\!]$ induced by $t \mapsto 0$.

In particular, a 1-PS $\lambda \colon \mathbb{G}_m \to G$ is a $k[t, t^{-1}]$-valued point, and Mumford writes $\langle \lambda \rangle$ for the same point considered as $k(\!(t)\!)$-valued (we still write λ).

In the following proofs, we follow Mumford [GIT, Theorem 2.1] closely, with our $[p^*]_d$ playing the role of the diagonalization of the $\mathbb{G}_m$-action. The labelling (A) and (B) of equations below is for easy comparison with Mumford.

Proof of "only if" in part (1). Suppose $\phi_{p^*}\colon G \to \mathbb{V}(V)$ is not proper. By the valuative criterion, there is a field extension $k \subset K$ and a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{Spec} K(\!(t)\!) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & G \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \cdot p^*} \\ \operatorname{Spec} K[\![t]\!] & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{V}(V) \end{array} \tag{1}$$

where ϕ is not $K[\![t]\!]$-valued (using that every complete DVR over k is of the form $K[\![t]\!]$). Moreover, if S is of finite type, then so is $\mathbb{V}(V)$, and then we may take $K[\![t]\!]$ to be the completed local ring at a closed point of a smooth curve over k, and thus assume $k = K$.

By the Iwahori theorem, there exists a 1-PS $\lambda\colon \mathbb{G}_m \to G$ and two $K[\![t]\!]$-valued points $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in G(K[\![t]\!])$ such that

$$\phi = \psi_1 \cdot \lambda \cdot \psi_2$$

(this is the product in the group $G(K(\!(t)\!))$). Since ϕ is not $K[\![t]\!]$-valued (this is the only use of that fact), the 1-PS λ is nontrivial, i.e. not k-valued. Let $b_i = \psi_i(0)$ be the specializations to $t = 0$ (we shall only use b_2).

We shall show that $\mu(b_2^{-1} \cdot \lambda \cdot b_2, p) \le 0$. In the group $G(K(\!(t)\!))$, we have

$$(\psi_1 \cdot b_2)^{-1} \cdot \phi = (b_2^{-1} \cdot \lambda \cdot b_2) \cdot (b_2^{-1} \cdot \psi_2)$$

and when this acts on p^*, viewed as an element of $\mathbb{V}(V)(K(\!(t)\!))$, we get

$$(\psi_1 \cdot b_2)^{-1} \cdot (\phi \cdot p^*) = (b_2^{-1} \cdot \lambda \cdot b_2) \cdot (b_2^{-1} \cdot \psi_2) \cdot p^* \tag{2}$$

and here $\phi \cdot p^*$ is $K[\![t]\!]$-valued, by diagram (1). Thus everything on the left is $K[\![t]\!]$-valued.

Now we use the grading $V = \bigoplus V_d$ corresponding to the 1-PS $b_2^{-1} \cdot \lambda \cdot b_2$. Then (2) gives

$$\begin{aligned} [(\psi_1 \cdot b_2)^{-1} \cdot (\phi \cdot p^*)]_d &= [(b_2^{-1} \cdot \lambda \cdot b_2) \cdot (b_2^{-1} \cdot \psi_2) \cdot p^*]_d \\ &= t^d [(b_2^{-1} \cdot \psi_2) \cdot p^*]_d \end{aligned}$$

where multiplication by t^d happens in $\operatorname{Hom}(V_d, K(\!(t)\!))$. For this to be $K[\![t]\!]$-valued, we must have

$$[(b_2^{-1} \cdot \psi_2) \cdot p^*]_d \in t^{-d} \operatorname{Hom}(V_d, K[\![t]\!]). \tag{A}$$

On the other hand, $b_2^{-1} \cdot \psi_2$ specializes to the identity $e \in G(K)$ at $t = 0$, so $b_2^{-1} \cdot \psi_2 \cdot p^*$ specializes to p^* at $t = 0$. Thus

$$[(b_2^{-1} \cdot \psi_2) \cdot p^*]_d = [p^*]_d + tZ_d \in \operatorname{Hom}(V_d, K[\![t]\!]) \tag{B}$$

for some $Z_d \in \operatorname{Hom}(V_d, K[\![t]\!])$.

Equations (A) and (B) imply that either $[p^*]_d = 0$ or $d \ge 0$. This proves that $\mu(b_2^{-1} \cdot \lambda \cdot b_2, p) \le 0$. □

Proof of "only if" in part (2). We first note that the zero section $0_S \subset \mathbb{V}(V)$ is G-invariant, so if it intersects the closure of $G{\cdot}p^*$, then the orbit is not closed. This prevents $\phi_{p^*}\colon G \to \mathbb{V}(V)$ from being proper, and this particular way of failing properness is detected by the valuative criterion by a diagram (1) in which $\phi \cdot p^*$ specializes to a point in the zero section 0_S at $t = 0$. Again, in the case where S is of finite type over k, there is a diagram (1) with $k = K$.

Consequently (with notation as in the proof of part (1)), $(\psi_1 \cdot b_2)^{-1} \cdot (\phi \cdot p^*)$ is not only $K[\![t]\!]$-valued, but specializes to a point in 0_S at $t = 0$ (since $\phi \cdot p^*$ does so, and 0_S is invariant, so $(\psi_1 \cdot b_2)^{-1}(0)$ must send $(\phi \cdot p^*)(0)$ to another point in 0_S). This means that

$$[(\psi_1 \cdot b_2)^{-1} \cdot (\phi \cdot p^*)]_d \in t \operatorname{Hom}(V_d, K[\![t]\!])$$

and then, instead of just (A) above, we get

$$[(b_2^{-1} \cdot \psi_2) \cdot p^*]_d \in t^{-d+1} \operatorname{Hom}(V_d, K[\![t]\!]). \qquad (\widetilde{A})$$

Combined with (B) as before, we conclude that either $[p^*]_d = 0$ or $d > 0$, so $\mu(b_2^{-1} \cdot \lambda \cdot b_2, p) < 0$. □

Proof of "if" in (1) and (2). Use the grading $V = \bigoplus V_d$ induced by the 1-PS λ. The $k[t, t^{-1}]$-valued point $\lambda \cdot p^*$ is uniquely determined by $\lambda \cdot f(p)$ (a $k[t, t^{-1}]$-valued point in S) together with

$$[\lambda \cdot p^*]_d = t^d [p^*]_d$$

for all d. When $\mu(\lambda, p) \leq 0$, we have $[p^*]_d = 0$ for all $d < 0$, This, together with $\lambda \cdot f(p)$ being $k[t]$-valued, implies that $\lambda \cdot p^*$ is $k[t]$-valued, i.e. it has a specialization at $t = 0$.

On the other hand, a nontrivial 1-PS $\lambda\colon \mathbb{G}_m \to G$ is never $k[t]$-valued, since the corresponding k-algebra-homomorphism must be compatible with the group inverse $\iota\colon G \to G$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma(G, \mathscr{O}_G) & \longrightarrow & k[t, t^{-1}] \\ \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \iota^*} & & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle t \mapsto t^{-1}} \\ \Gamma(G, \mathscr{O}_G) & \longrightarrow & k[t, t^{-1}] \end{array}$$

Thus, the image $\lambda^*(\Gamma(G, \mathscr{O}_G))$ is invariant under $t \mapsto t^{-1}$, but then the image is either k or $k[t, t^{-1}]$. It follows that λ gives rise to a diagram (1), preventing properness. This proves "if" in claim (1).

When $\mu(\lambda, p) < 0$, we have $[p^*]_d = 0$ for $d \leq 0$. The specialization p_0^* of $\lambda \cdot p^*$ to $t = 0$ thus satisfies $[p_0^*]_d = 0$ for all d, so p_0^* is a point in the zero section 0_S. It is clearly in the closure of $G \cdot p^*$. This proves "if" in claim (2). □

6. Examples

6.1. **An elementary example.** We start with a first example where $X = \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{A}^2, S = \mathbb{A}^2$ and the map $f : X \to S$ is given by projection onto the second factor. We consider the action of the group $G = \mathbb{G}_m = \operatorname{Spec} k[t, t^{-1}]$ on X by $((u : v), x, y) \mapsto ((tu : v/t), tx, y/t)$ and on S by $(x, y) \mapsto (tx, y/t)$. Clearly, f is then G-equivariant. The group action of G on X can be linearized by replacing $\mathbb{P}^1$ by $\mathbb{A}^2$ with affine coordinates (u, v) and the action $(u, v) \mapsto (tu, v/t)$. We shall work with the G-linearized line bundle $\mathscr{L}$ given by the pullback of $\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$ and we shall first analyse the (semi-)stable and unstable points of X by using Theorem 3.3. According to this theorem points $p \in X$ which are not stable are detected by non-trivial 1-parameter subgroups λ of G. A necessary condition for a point p not to be stable is that the limit $\lim_{t\to 0} \lambda(t)f(p)$ exists. This shows immediately that points p with $x, y \neq 0$ are always stable. Now assume $y = 0$. For $\lim_{t\to 0} \lambda(t)f(p)$ to exist we must have $\lambda(t) = t^d$ with $d > 0$. If $v \neq 0$, then $\mu(\lambda, p) = d > 0$ and thus there cannot be a destabilizing 1-parameter subgroup. On the other hand if $v = 0$, then $\mu(\lambda, p) = -d < 0$ and hence these points are unstable. The same argument shows that the points $x = u = 0$ are unstable, whereas the points $x = 0, u \neq 0$ are stable. In this example there are no strictly semi-stable points.

The good quotient S/G is easy to understand. Let $A = k[x, y]$. Then $A^G = k[T]$ where $T = xy$. The fibres of the map $S \to \operatorname{Spec} k[x, y]^G = \operatorname{Spec} k[T] = \mathbb{A}^1$ away from the origin are the closed orbits $xy = T \neq 0$, whereas the coordinate axes are mapped to the origin. Next we turn to $X = \operatorname{Proj} A[u, v]$. We have $A[u, v]^G = k[xy, xv, yu, uv]$. Renaming these generators by $T = xy$, $X = xv$, $Y = yu$, $Z = uv$ we find that $A[u, v]^G = A^G[X, Y, Z]/(XY - TZ)$. Thus $X^s/G \to \operatorname{Spec} A^G$ is a conic bundle with two lines intersecting transversally over the origin. The singular point in the central fibre is the image of points $x = y = 0$ and $uv \neq 0$. The orbits of stable points with $x = 0, y \neq 0$ and $y = 0, x \neq 0$ are mapped to the smooth points of the two components of the central fibre . We remark that X^s/G lives in $\mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2)$ and has an ordinary A_1-singularity at $X = Y = T = 0$, i.e. where the two lines in the central fibre meet. The singularity arises since the points in the orbit $x = y = 0$, $uv \neq 0$ have nontrivial stabilizer group μ_2.

6.2. **A degeneration of Hilbert schemes on conics.** The next example illustrates how our results can be used to study Hilbert schemes for a semi-stable degeneration of curves. In a subsequent paper we shall use this approach to study degenerations of Hilbert schemes more generally, notably in the setting of $K3$ surfaces.

We put $X = V(tz^2 - xy) \subset \mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$. The semi-stable fibration

$$f \colon X \to \mathbb{A}^1 = \operatorname{Spec} k[t]$$

degenerates a smooth conic into a union of two lines $Y = V(t, x)$ and $Y' = V(t, y)$ intersecting transversally in a point $\mathfrak{p}$. The Hilbert scheme $\mathrm{Hilb}^n_{X/\mathbb{A}^1}$ and its central fibre have quite bad singularities due to the presence of subschemes with $\mathfrak{p}$ contained in the support. We shall construct a better behaved compactification of $\mathrm{Hilb}^n_{X^{\mathrm{sm}}/\mathbb{A}^1} \to \mathbb{A}^1$, where $X^{\mathrm{sm}} = X - \{\mathfrak{p}\}$. Indeed, the stack of Li–Wu [LW] yields such a compactification; we shall give a GIT version of their construction.

Roughly, the idea is to replace $\mathfrak{p}$ by a chain of smooth rational curves linking Y and Y', and add certain subschemes of length n supported in the *smooth* locus of the resulting semi-stable curve.

An important tool is Li's so-called *expanded degenerations*

$$f[n]\colon X[n] \to \mathbb{A}^{n+1}$$

of the map f. We will start by explaining a few key points of this theory, for more details see [Li] and [ACFW] (where it is also explained that the final result is independent of the various choices which one makes in the construction).

Let s and s' be defining sections of the effective divisors Y and Y', and let $\mathbb{A}^2 \to \mathbb{A}^1$ be the map $(t_1, t_2) \mapsto t_1 t_2$. Then $X \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} \mathbb{A}^2$ has an A_1-singularity, locally of the form $ss' - t_1 t_2 = 0$. The blow up $\pi_1\colon X[1] \to X \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} \mathbb{A}^2$ in $Y \times V(t_2)$ resolves this singularity by a small resolution, and the induced map $X[1] \to \mathbb{A}^2$ is $f[1]$.

The scheme $X[1]$ is a closed subscheme of the $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle

$$\mathbb{P}[1] := \mathbb{P}(p_1^*\mathscr{O}_X(-Y) \oplus \mathscr{O}_{X \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} \mathbb{A}^2})$$

over $X \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} \mathbb{A}^2$, cut out by equations $sv_1 - t_2 u_1 = 0$ and $t_1 v_1 - s' u_1 = 0$, where u_1 and v_1 denote homogeneous coordinates in the fibres.

We let the torus $G[1] := \operatorname{Spec} k[\sigma_1, \sigma_1^{-1}]$ act on $\mathbb{A}^2$ by $(t_1, t_2) \mapsto (\sigma_1 t_1, \sigma_1^{-1} t_2)$. Then $Y \times V(t_2)$ is invariant for the induced action on $X \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} \mathbb{A}^2$, hence the action lifts uniquely to $X[1]$. Letting $G[1]$ act on $\mathbb{P}[1]$ by $(u_1 : v_1) \mapsto (\sigma_1 u_1 : v_1)$; also $X[1] \subset \mathbb{P}[1]$ is equivariant.

Composing $f[1]$ with the projection from $\mathbb{A}^2$ to its t_2-factor gives a map $X[1] \to \mathbb{A}^1$, the central fibre is again a union of smooth irreducible components Y_1 and Y_1' intersecting transversally. This fact allows one to iterate the above procedure; inductively, one constructs $X[n]$ as $X[n-1][1]$. Again, $X[n]$ is a closed subscheme of a $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle $\mathbb{P}[n]$ over $X[n-1] \times_{\mathbb{A}^n} \mathbb{A}^{n+1}$, inducing a natural fibration $f[n]\colon X[n] \to \mathbb{A}^{n+1}$.

The torus $G[n] := \operatorname{Spec} k[\sigma_1^{\pm 1}, \ldots, \sigma_n^{\pm 1}]$ acts on $f[n]$, compatibly with the $G[n-1]$-action on $f[n-1]$; on $\mathbb{A}^{n+1}$ by

$$(t_1, \ldots, t_i, \ldots, t_{n+1}) \mapsto (\sigma_1 t_1, \ldots, \sigma_i \sigma_{i-1}^{-1} t_i, \ldots, \sigma_n^{-1} t_{n+1})$$

and in the $\mathbb{P}^1$-fibres of $\mathbb{P}[n]$ by $(u_n : v_n) \mapsto (\sigma_n u_n : v_n)$.

We introduced the $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundles above in order to construct a useful $G[n]$-linearized sheaf $\mathscr{L}$ on $X[n]$. Fix an ample sheaf $\mathscr{O}_X(1)$ on X and let $\mathscr{O}_{\pi_i}(1)$ denote the restriction to $X[i]$ of the hyperplane bundle on

$\mathbb{P}[i]$. For suitable integers $0 \ll a_{n-1} \ll \ldots \ll a_0$, the invertible sheaf

$$\mathscr{L}_1 := \mathscr{O}_{\pi_n}(1) \otimes g_{n-1}^* \mathscr{O}_{\pi_{n-1}}(a_{n-1}) \otimes \ldots \otimes g_0^* \mathscr{O}_X(a_0)$$

is very ample for $f[n]$ [Liu, 8.1.22]. Here g_i denotes the obvious map from $X[n]$ to $X[i]$ (with $X[0] := X$).

For each i, we define a $G[i]$-linearization on $\mathscr{O}_{\pi_i}(n+1)$ by

$$u_i^\ell v_i^{n+1-\ell} \mapsto \sigma_i^{i-(n+1)+\ell} u_i^\ell v_i^{n+1-\ell}$$

for $0 \leq \ell \leq n+1$, where the monomials are viewed as sections of $\mathscr{O}_{\pi_i}(n+1)$. This induces canonically a $G[n]$-linearization on $\mathscr{L}_1^{n+1}$. Linearizing $\mathscr{L}_1^{n+1}$ rather than $\mathscr{L}_1$ is quite crucial; it will yield a better semi-stable locus in the Hilbert scheme later on. We need also to take a suitable N-th power of this sheaf, thus in the end we put $\mathscr{L} := \mathscr{L}_1^{(n+1)N}$. (The integers $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ and N play only a formal role.)

Consider finally $\mathcal{H}[n] := \mathrm{Hilb}^n_{X[n]/\mathbb{A}^{n+1}}$, and its universal family

$$\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{H}[n] \times_{\mathbb{A}^{n+1}} X[n].$$

For N sufficiently large, the line bundle $\mathscr{M} := \det p_{1*} \left(p_2^* \mathscr{L}\right)|_{\mathcal{Z}}$ on $\mathcal{H}[n]$ is relatively very ample [HL, Prop. 2.2.5] and inherits a linearization from $\mathscr{L}$. Proposition 2.6 now asserts that the map between the good quotients

$$\mathcal{H}^n_{X/\mathbb{A}^1} := \mathcal{H}[n]^{ss}(\mathscr{M})/G[n] \to \mathbb{A}^{n+1}/G[n] = \mathbb{A}^1$$

is *projective*. This is our compactification of $\mathrm{Hilb}^n_{X^{\mathrm{sm}}/\mathbb{A}^1} \to \mathbb{A}^1$.

Even though the global structure of $\mathscr{M}$ might be complicated, we can control the fibres of $\mathscr{M}$ sufficiently well in order to apply Theorem 5.4. As we shall see below, this will yield a neat description of the (semi-)stable locus. Before we formulate this, we need to discuss the fibres of $f[n]$.

The fibre $X[n]_0$ over the origin in $\mathbb{A}^{n+1}$ forms a transversal chain

$$Y \cong \Delta_0 \cup \ldots \cup \Delta_i \cup \ldots \cup \Delta_{n+1} \cong Y',$$

where $\Delta_i \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. The torus $G[n]$ acts trivially on Δ_0 and Δ_{n+1}, and otherwise scales a coordinate of Δ_i with σ_i, keeping the intersection points fixed. Generally, if q belongs to the stratum where t_i is zero precisely for the indices $i_1 < \ldots < i_r$, then $X[n]_q$ has the form

$$Y \cong \Delta_{I_0} \cup \ldots \cup \Delta_{I_k} \cup \ldots \cup \Delta_{I_r} \cong Y'$$

where $I_k = \{i_k, \ldots, i_{k+1} - 1\}$ and Δ_{I_k} is a smoothing of the "sub-chain" $\Delta_{i_k} \cup \ldots \cup \Delta_{i_{k+1}-1}$ as the parameters indexed by I_k become nonzero. We write $\Delta^\circ_{I_k}$ for the component Δ_{I_k} with the double locus removed.

Analysing the stability criterion we arrive at the following description of the semi-stable locus:

- A subscheme $Z \subset X[n]_q$ of length n is semi-stable if and only if

$$\mathit{length}(Z \cap \Delta^\circ_{I_k}) = \mathit{cardinality}(I_k \cap \{1, \ldots, n\})$$

holds for every irreducible component Δ_{I_k} of $X[n]_q$. Moreover, any semi-stable point is also stable (for details on the case $n = 2$ see below).

Note, in particular, that a semi-stable Z does not meet the singular locus of $X[n]_q$. Thus the composition $\mathcal{H}[n]^{ss} \to \mathbb{A}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{A}^1$ consists of a smooth map followed by the multiplication $t \mapsto t_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot t_{n+1}$. One easily deduces that $\mathcal{H}^n_{X/\mathbb{A}^1} \to \mathbb{A}^1$ is, up to finite quotient singularities, a semi-stable degeneration. Alternatively; the stack quotient $[\mathcal{H}[n]^{ss}/G[n]] \to \mathbb{A}^1$ is a proper, semi-stable degeneration. Note also that since $\mathcal{H}[n]^{ss} = \mathcal{H}[n]^s$, the quotient $\mathcal{H}^n_{X/\mathbb{A}^1}$ is an orbit space.

We note that the characterization of GIT stability in $\mathcal{H}[n]$ we have deduced using the numerical criterion, essentially coincides with the definition of admissibility in [LW]. Also, properness of the quotient map is in our case an immediate consequence of Proposition 2.6.

We now discuss the case $n = 2$ in some detail, to illustrate the results mentioned above. We start by making a key observation. Let Z be a length 2 subscheme in a fibre of $f[2]$ and let λ be a 1-PS for which the limit Z_0 of Z exists. If $Z_0 = \{p_0, p_0'\}$ is reduced, then

$$\mathscr{M}(Z_0) \cong \mathscr{L}(p_0) \otimes \mathscr{L}(p_0'),$$

thus the $\mathbb{G}_m$-weight on $\mathscr{M}(Z_0)$ can be computed from the weights on $\mathscr{L}$ at p_0 and p_0'. If Z_0 is supported in a single point p_0, it is not true that $\mathscr{M}(Z_0) \cong \mathscr{L}(p_0)^{\otimes 2}$. However, one can show that the error term one gets when replacing $\mu(\lambda, Z)$ by twice the $\mathbb{G}_m$-weight on $\mathscr{L}(p_0)$ becomes negligible when $N \gg 0$. Thus, in our computations, it suffices to consider formal sums of points in the fibres of $f[2]$.

For $Z \subset X[2]_0$ this can be detailed as follows. Let λ be a 1-PS of $G[2]$ corresponding to $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Fixing a coordinate σ for λ, the action in the $\mathbb{P}^1$-fibres is $(\sigma^{s_i} u_i : v_i)$. Let $p \in \mathrm{Supp}(Z)$ and put $p_0 := \lim_{\sigma \to 0} \lambda(\sigma) \cdot p$. If $p \in \Delta_j^\circ$ where $j \in \{0, 3\}$, we have $p = p_0$. If however $j \in \{1, 2\}$, both u_j and v_j are nonzero at p, and easy computations show that $u_j = 0$ at p_0 if $s_j > 0$ and that $v_j = 0$ at p_0 if $s_j < 0$.

Now we will compute the $\mathbb{G}_m$-weight $\mu(\lambda, p)$ on $\mathscr{L}(p_0)$. Assume first that $p \in \Delta_1^\circ$. If $s_1 > 0$, then $\mathscr{L}(p_0)$ is generated by $(v_1^{3a_1} v_2^3)^N$. If instead $s_1 < 0$, then $\mathscr{L}(p_0)$ is generated by $(u_1^{3a_1} v_2^3)^N$. In any case, we find

$$\mu(\lambda, p) = N(-a_1(1/2 s_1 - 3/2|s_1|) - s_2).$$

Assuming instead that $p \in \Delta_2^\circ$, a similar computation yields

$$\mu(\lambda, p) = N(a_1 s_1 + 1/2 s_2 - 3/2|s_2|).$$

Hence, for $Z = \{p_1, p_2\}$ where $p_j \in \Delta_j^\circ$, we get

$$\mu(\lambda, Z) = N(a_1(1/2 s_1 - 3/2|s_1|) - (1/2 s_2 + 3/2|s_2|)).$$

In particular, we find that $\mu(\lambda, Z) \leq 0$ with equality if and only if $s_1 = s_2 = 0$, i.e., if λ is trivial. This means that Z is stable.

Lastly, let us say a few words about the geometry of $\mathcal{H}^2_{X/\mathbb{A}^1} \to \mathbb{A}^1$. Over the stratum in $\mathbb{A}^3$ where $t_1 = t_3 = 0$ and $t_2 \neq 0$, the fibres of $f[2]$

have a component $\Delta_{\{1,2\}}$, where $\Delta^\circ_{\{1,2\}} \cong \mathbb{G}_m$ and where the diagonal torus in $G[2]$ acts by $w \mapsto \sigma \cdot w$ for a coordinate w of $\mathbb{G}_m$. Thus, the subschemes $\{p, -p\} \subset \Delta^\circ_{\{1,2\}}$ have stabiliser μ_2 and one can check that the action is free outside this locus. This yields an isolated A_1 singularity in $\mathcal{H}^2_{X/\mathbb{A}^1}$. Our family degenerates $\mathbb{P}^2$ into a union of rational surfaces H_{20}, H_{11} and H_{02}, where the generic point on H_{ij} corresponds to i points on Y° and j points on $(Y')^\circ$. One easily checks that the H_{ij}-s intersect pairwise in an irreducible curve, with triple intersection a point, i.e., the dual graph forms a 2-simplex. For instance, to describe $H_{2,0} \cap H_{0,2}$, note that both $\Delta_{\{0,1,2\}} \cup \Delta_3$ and $\Delta_0 \cup \Delta_{\{1,2,3\}}$ are smoothings of $\Delta_0 \cup \Delta_{\{1,2\}} \cup \Delta_3$ as t_1, resp. t_3, becomes nonzero. By our description of the (semi-)stable locus, this means that H_{20} and H_{02} intersect precisely in the closure of the locus consisting of stable subschemes of $\Delta_0 \cup \Delta_{\{1,2\}} \cup \Delta_3$, modulo the action of the diagonal torus in $G[2]$.

References

[ACFW] D. Abramovich, C. Cadman, B. Fantechi, J. Wise. *Expanded degenerations and pairs.* Comm. Algebra 41 (2013), no. 6, 2346–2386.

[Hu] Y. Hu. *Relative geometric invariant theory and universal moduli spaces.* Internat. J. Math. 7 (1996), no. 2, 151–181.

[HL] D. Huybrechts and M. Lehn. *The geometry of moduli spaces of sheaves.* Aspects of Mathematics, E31, Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, 1997, xiv+269 pp.

[Ke] G. Kempf. *Instability in invariant theory.* Annals of Mathematics (2) 108 (1978), no. 2, 299–316.

[Kin] A. D. King. *Moduli of representations of finite-dimensional algebras.* Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) 45 (1994), no. 180, 515–530.

[Li] J. Li. *Stable morphisms to singular schemes and relative stable morphisms.* J. Differential Geom. 57 (2001), no. 3, 509–578.

[LW] J. Li, B. Wu. *Good degenerations of Quot-schemes and coherent systems.* Preprint (2011), arXiv:1110.0390.

[Liu] Q. Liu. *Algebraic geometry and arithmetic curves*. Volume 6 of *Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Oxford University Press, 2002.

[GIT] D. Mumford, J. Fogarty, F. Kirwan. Geometric invariant theory. Third edition. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (2) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (2)], 34, *Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994. xiv+292 pp.*

[New] P. Newstead. Introduction to moduli problems and orbit spaces. Tata Institute of Fundamental Research Lectures on Mathematics and Physics, 51, *Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay; by the Narosa Publishing House, New Delhi, 1978, vi+183 pp.*

[Rei] Z. Reichstein. *Stability and equivariant maps.* Invent. Math. 96 (1989), no. 2, 349–383.

[Sch] A. Schmitt. *Global boundedness for decorated sheaves* Int. Math. Res. Not. 68 (2004), 3637–3671.

[Sesh] C. S. Seshadri. *Quotient spaces modulo reductive algebraic groups.* Ann. of Math. (2) 95 (1972), no. 95, 511–556.

[Sesh2] C. S. Seshadri. *Geometric reductivity over arbitrary base.* Advances in Math. 26 (1977), no. 3, 225–274.

[Stacks] The Stacks Project Authors, *Stacks Project* http://stacks.math.columbia.edu, 2014

University of Stavanger, Department of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, 4036 Stavanger, Norway
E-mail address: martin.gulbrandsen@uis.no

University of Copenhagen, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Universitetsparken 5, 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark
E-mail address: larshhal@math.ku.dk

Leibniz Universität Hannover, Institut für algebraische Geometrie, Welfengarten 1, 30060 Hannover, Germany
E-mail address: hulek@math.uni-hannover.de, hulek@ias.edu
Current address: Institute for Advanced Study, School of Mathematics, 1 Einstein Drive, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA